



## **DORCHESTER COUNTY BUSINESS SERVICES**

**Rebecca Dantzler, Purchasing Services Manager**

201 Johnston Street

St. George, SC 29477

Phone: (843) 563-0142

November 22, 2019

To: Selection Committee Members

RE: Explanation of Ranking Tabulation

Often, when the overall evaluation scores are close or tied, I will assign points based on the ranking from evaluation scores submitted by the team members especially when the top-scored company is not the majority's number-one choice. According to the scores received for each criterion, the firms are placed in order from top-ranked to lowest-ranked. If two or more firms received the same scoring, they share the same ranking status and assignment of points. For example:

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Company A</b>	<b>Company B</b>	<b>Company C</b>	<b>Company D</b>	<b>Company E</b>	<b>Company F</b>
40 Points Max- Qualifications	40	40	38	35	30	30

The scores assigned to each ranking would be as follows:

1 <sup>st</sup> Place:	40 points	(6/6, or 100%)
2 <sup>nd</sup> Place:	33 points	(5/6, or 83%)
3 <sup>rd</sup> Place:	27 points	(4/6, or 67%)
4 <sup>th</sup> Place	20 points	(3/6, or 50%)
5 <sup>th</sup> Place	13 points	(2/6, or 33%)
6 <sup>th</sup> Place	7 points	(1/6, or 17%)

If these were the scores given by Evaluator 1, the ranking of the companies would be:

1<sup>st</sup> Place: Company A and B

3<sup>rd</sup> Place: Company C (because two companies were considered better-qualified)

4<sup>th</sup> Place: Company D (three companies were considered better-qualified)

5<sup>th</sup> Place: Company E and F (four companies were considered better-qualified than these two companies)

Therefore, the points for the companies according to their rank would be:

Company A: 40 points

Company B: 40 points

Company C: 27 points

Company D: 20 points

Company E: 13 points

Company F: 13 points

This is standard competition ranking, which is beneficial in determining which companies were truly rated the highest. It helps differentiate the subjectivity and possible skewed results that can often appear when multiple evaluators are scoring proposals in an inconsistent manner.

With this said, the evaluation tabulation based on the committee's scores resulted in the top-scored companies below:

#1 – Weston & Sampson (94.2 points)  
2 out of 5 evaluators' top-choice

#2 – ESP Associates, Inc. (93.0 points)  
3 out of 5 evaluators' top-choice

After conducting an evaluation tabulation based on the ranking of the companies, the results were clearer:

#1 – ESP Associates, Inc. (94.6 points)  
#2 – Weston & Sampson (90.0 points)

On November 22, 2019, the selection committee met to discuss the qualifications statements and the evaluations. Some team members felt that it was in Dorchester County's best interest to proceed with ESP Associates, Inc., which was the majority's top-choice and highest-scored company in the ranking. However, due to the closeness of the scores, it is my recommendation that interviews be conducted with the top two companies – ESP Associates and Weston & Sampson. After the interviews, a selection will be made as to which company will fit the needs of the county.

I will reach out to both companies and schedule interviews for the week of December 2, 2019.

Attached, you will find the ranking evaluation, a tabulation of the initial scores, individual score sheets, and spreadsheets showing the exclusion of each evaluator – to demonstrate score discrepancies.

RFQ#2020-3282-3306-26  
Engineering Services for Poplar Grove Pump Station  
INITIAL Evaluation Tabulation

#1 Score						
Alliance Consulting Group						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	38.00	16.00	34.00	20.00	30.00	27.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	18.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	18.40
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	19.00	18.00	20.00	18.40
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	18.00
Total	94.00	64.00	91.00	78.00	85.00	82.40
ESP Associates, Inc.						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	40.00	38.00	38.00	20.00	35.20
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	20.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.20
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	20.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.60
Total	99.00	90.00	98.00	98.00	80.00	93.00
Hydrostructure Utility C&E						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	10.00	16.00	32.00	20.00	0.00	15.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	15.00	16.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	17.20
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	17.00	16.00	14.00	17.00	10.00	14.80
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	18.20
Total	60.00	66.00	81.00	77.00	45.00	65.80
Seamon Whiteside						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	20.00	16.00	35.00	20.00	0.00	18.20
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	14.00	16.00	20.00	15.00	16.80
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	18.00	16.00	18.00	18.00	15.00	17.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	17.80
Total	75.00	62.00	89.00	78.00	45.00	69.80
Thomas & Hutton						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	25.00	40.00	38.00	25.00	40.00	33.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	18.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	16.00	18.00	17.00	20.00	17.40
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	17.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.60
Total	77.00	88.00	94.00	82.00	100.00	88.20
Weston & Sampson						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	32.00	40.00	39.00	37.00	40.00	37.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	14.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
Total	89.00	86.00	99.00	97.00	100.00	94.20

RFQ#2020-3282-3306-26  
Engineering Services for Poplar Grove Pump Station  
Evaluation Tabulation BASED ON RANK

#1 Score						
Alliance Consulting Group						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	33.00	20.00	13.00	20.00	27.00	22.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	7.00	20.00	13.00	20.00	20.00	16.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	20.00	20.00	13.00	13.00	20.00	17.20
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	17.00	13.00	20.00	20.00	10.00	16.00
Total	77.00	73.00	59.00	73.00	77.00	71.80
ESP Associates, Inc.						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	40.00	33.00	40.00	20.00	34.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Total	100.00	100.00	93.00	100.00	80.00	94.60
Hydrostructure Utility C&E						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	7.00	20.00	7.00	20.00	13.00	13.40
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	3.00	20.00	3.00	20.00	20.00	13.20
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	7.00	20.00	3.00	7.00	3.00	8.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	10.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	10.00	16.00
Total	27.00	80.00	33.00	67.00	46.00	50.60
Seamon Whiteside						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	13.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	13.00	17.20
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	17.00	3.00	7.00	20.00	3.00	10.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	10.00	20.00	10.00	13.00	7.00	12.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	10.00	13.00	20.00	20.00	10.00	14.60
Total	50.00	56.00	57.00	73.00	33.00	53.80
Thomas & Hutton						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	20.00	40.00	33.00	27.00	40.00	32.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	17.00	20.00	13.00	20.00	20.00	18.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	3.00	20.00	10.00	7.00	20.00	12.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	3.00	13.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	15.20
Total	43.00	93.00	76.00	74.00	100.00	77.20
Weston & Sampson						
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	27.00	40.00	40.00	33.00	40.00	36.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	17.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.40
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	20.00	3.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	16.60
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	17.00	13.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.00
Total	81.00	76.00	100.00	93.00	100.00	90.00

RFQ#2020-3282-3306-26  
Evaluator \_\_1\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Alliance Consulting Group	Comments	ESP Associates, Inc.	Comments	Hydrostructure s Utility C&E	Comments	Seamon Whiteside	Comments	Thomas & Hutton	Comments	Weston & Sampson	Comments
Teams understanding of the specific requirements of this project (40 Points)	38.00	Good understanding of the Project	40.00	Specific Knowledge of Project	10.00	No real discussion of the project	20.00	Did not show understanding of specific project requirements.	25.00	No real detail understanding of the project	32.00	More of a generic project approach
Experience, qualifications, and technical competence of the staff proposed for the type of work required (20 Points)	18.00	Staff competent	20.00	Staff Competent	15.00	Most of the detail design experience is with the Subcontractor	19.00	Staff Competent	19.00	Staff Competent	19.00	Staff competent
Past performance of the firm/team on similar type projects (20 Points)	19.00	Performed many similar sized project	19.00	Performed similar sized projects. Also did the predesign for this project.	17.00	Few Real projects performed by Prim	18.00	Several projects of similar size and scope	16.00	Several projects of similar size and scope	19.00	Several projects of similar size and scope
Availability of proposed staff and ability to be responsive to SCDHEC requirements (20 Points)	19.00	Staff competent	20.00	Staff Competent	18.00	Staff competent. Experience is from Subcontractor	18.00	Staff Competent	17.00	Staff Competent	19.00	Staff competent
Total	94.00		99.00		60.00		75.00		77.00		89.00	

RFP#2020-3282-3306-26  
Engineering Services for Poplar Grove Pump Station  
INITIAL Evaluation Tabulation  
**EXCLUDING #1**

#1 Score					
Alliance Consulting Group					
Criteria	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	16.00	34.00	20.00	30.00	25.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	16.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	18.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	19.00	18.00	20.00	18.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	16.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	17.75
Total	64.00	91.00	78.00	85.00	79.50
ESP Associates, Inc.					
Criteria	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	38.00	38.00	20.00	34.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.50
Total	90.00	98.00	98.00	80.00	91.50
Hydrostructure Utility C&E					
Criteria	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	16.00	32.00	20.00	0.00	17.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	16.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	17.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	14.00	17.00	10.00	14.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	18.25
Total	66.00	81.00	77.00	45.00	67.25
Seamon Whiteside					
Criteria	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	16.00	35.00	20.00	0.00	17.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	14.00	16.00	20.00	15.00	16.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	18.00	18.00	15.00	16.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	16.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	17.75
Total	62.00	89.00	78.00	45.00	68.50
Thomas & Hutton					
Criteria	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	38.00	25.00	40.00	35.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	16.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	18.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	18.00	17.00	20.00	17.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
Total	88.00	94.00	82.00	100.00	91.00
Weston & Sampson					
Criteria	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	39.00	37.00	40.00	39.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	14.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	16.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
Total	86.00	99.00	97.00	100.00	95.50

Criteria	Alliance Consulting Group	Comments	ESP Associates, Inc.	Comments	Hydrostructure s Utility C&E	Comments	Seamon Whiteside	Comments	Thomas & Hutton	Comments	Weston & Sampson	Comments
Teams understanding of the specific requirements of this project (40 Points)	16.00	Discussion of project not included	40.00	Has significant experience with the site	16.00	Discussion of project not included	16.00	Discussion of project not included	40.00	Has significant experience with the site	40.00	Has significant experience with the site.
Experience, qualifications, and technical competence of the staff proposed for the type of work required (20 Points)	16.00		16.00		16.00		14.00	Worked on similar sized projects but lacks experience working for a utility.	16.00		16.00	
Past performance of the firm/team on similar type projects (20 Points)	16.00		16.00		16.00		16.00		16.00		14.00	References work done on a project in DCWS service area but has not contacted DCWS staff about the project.
Availability of proposed staff and ability to be responsive to SCDHEC requirements (20 Points)	16.00		18.00	Indicates more availability than other	18.00	Stresses accessibility of owners and experienced staff.	16.00		16.00		16.00	
Total	64.00		90.00		66.00		62.00		88.00		86.00	



RFP#2020-3282-3306-26  
Engineering Services for Poplar Grove Pump Station  
INITIAL Evaluation Tabulation  
**EXCLUDING #2**

#1 Score					
Alliance Consulting Group					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	38.00	34.00	20.00	30.00	30.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	18.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	19.00	18.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	18.50
Total	94.00	91.00	78.00	85.00	87.00
ESP Associates, Inc.					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	38.00	38.00	20.00	34.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Total	99.00	98.00	98.00	80.00	93.75
Hydrostructure Utility C&E					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	10.00	32.00	20.00	0.00	15.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	15.00	15.00	20.00	20.00	17.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	17.00	14.00	17.00	10.00	14.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	18.25
Total	60.00	81.00	77.00	45.00	65.75
Seamon Whiteside					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	20.00	35.00	20.00	0.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	20.00	15.00	17.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	18.00	18.00	18.00	15.00	17.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	20.00	20.00	15.00	18.25
Total	75.00	89.00	78.00	45.00	71.75
Thomas & Hutton					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	25.00	38.00	25.00	40.00	32.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	19.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	18.00	17.00	20.00	17.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	17.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.25
Total	77.00	94.00	82.00	100.00	88.25
Weston & Sampson					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	32.00	39.00	37.00	40.00	37.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.75
Total	89.00	99.00	97.00	100.00	96.25



RFQ#2020-3282-3306-26  
Evaluator #3

Criteria	Alliance Consulting Group	Comments	ESP Associates, Inc.	Comments	Hydrostructure s Utility C&E	Comments	Seamon Whiteside	Comments	Thomas & Hutton	Comments	Weston & Sampson	Comments
Teams understanding of the specific requirements of this project (40 Points)	34.00	Team highly capable from past work experiences.	38.00	Good direct response. Not much detail but to the point.	32.00	The team understands the project scope but needs to partner with an outside consulting firm.	35.00	Past work indicates team is highly capable but did not mention DCWS specific requirements.	38.00	Team understands the project as specified by DCWS. Excellent Detailed Scope of Services.	39.00	Direct response was straightforward and very well presented.
Experience, qualifications, and technical competence of the staff proposed for the type of work required (20 Points)	18.00	Team has project specific experience.	20.00	Very diverse group. Age and experience.	15.00	The bulk of the design will be done by G. Robert George a subcontracted engineering firm. Hydrostructures does more mainline work.	16.00	Staff has the qualifications but seems young as a whole. Senior Project Manager seems to be very capable.	18.00	Team is comprised of many individuals who have worked on Dorchester County projects recently.	20.00	Many projects completed are similar to DCWS's need.
Past performance of the firm/team on similar type projects (20 Points)	19.00	Recent projects mimic DCWS project needs.	20.00	Very similar recent projects completed in the last 5 years.	14.00	Most projects listed consist of assesments to existing lines in need of rehabilitation.	18.00	Staff more experienced in master planning for the most part.	18.00	Extensive list of past similar projects.	20.00	Team members have been involved in many similar projects within the last few years.
Availability of proposed staff and ability to be responsive to SCDHEC requirements (20 Points)	20.00	No comment	20.00	No comment	20.00	No comment	20.00	No comment	20.00	No comment	20.00	No comment
Total	91.00		98.00		81.00		89.00		94.00		99.00	

RFP#2020-3282-3306-26  
Engineering Services for Poplar Grove Pump Station  
INITIAL Evaluation Tabulation  
**EXCLUDING #3**

#1 Score					
<i>Alliance Consulting Group</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	38.00	16.00	20.00	30.00	26.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	18.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	18.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	15.00	17.50
Total	94.00	64.00	78.00	85.00	80.25
<i>ESP Associates, Inc.</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	40.00	38.00	20.00	34.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	20.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	20.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	19.50
Total	99.00	90.00	98.00	80.00	91.75
<i>Hydrostructure Utility C&amp;E</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	10.00	16.00	20.00	0.00	11.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	15.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	17.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	17.00	16.00	17.00	10.00	15.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	18.00	20.00	15.00	17.75
Total	60.00	66.00	77.00	45.00	62.00
<i>Seamon Whiteside</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	20.00	16.00	20.00	0.00	14.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	14.00	20.00	15.00	17.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	18.00	16.00	18.00	15.00	16.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	16.00	20.00	15.00	17.25
Total	75.00	62.00	78.00	45.00	65.00
<i>Thomas &amp; Hutton</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	25.00	40.00	25.00	40.00	32.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	16.00	17.00	20.00	17.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	17.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.25
Total	77.00	88.00	82.00	100.00	86.75
<i>Weston &amp; Sampson</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 4	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	32.00	40.00	37.00	40.00	37.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	14.00	20.00	20.00	18.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
Total	89.00	86.00	97.00	100.00	93.00

Criteria	Alliance Consulting Group	Comments	ESP Associates, Inc.	Comments	Hydrostructure s Utility C&E	Comments	Seamon Whiteside	Comments	Thomas & Hutton	Comments	Weston & Sampson	Comments
Teams understanding of the specific requirements of this project (40 Points)	20	Proposal does not have this information	38	Good history and knowledge of area	20	Proposal does not have this information	20	Proposal does not have this information	25	Minimal Write Up	37	Worked on a Poplar Grove Development
Experience, qualifications, and technical competence of the staff proposed for the type of work required (20 Points)	20	Good Experience	20	Good Experience	20	Good Experience	20	Good Experience	20	Good Experience	20	Good Experience
Past performance of the firm/team on similar type projects (20 Points)	18	Muckenfuss, a lot of residential developments	20	Did the Poplar Grove Eval	17	JISP	18	Watson Hill, Camp Hall	17	A lot in Berkeley	20	A lot in the area
Availability of proposed staff and ability to be responsive to SCDHEC requirements (20 Points)	20	Good availability	20	Good availability	20	Good availability	20	Good availability	20	Good availability	20	Good availability
Total	78		98		77		78		82		97	

RFP#2020-3282-3306-26  
Engineering Services for Poplar Grove Pump Station  
INITIAL Evaluation Tabulation  
**EXCLUDING #4**

#1 Score					
<i>Alliance Consulting Group</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	38.00	16.00	34.00	30.00	29.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	18.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	18.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	19.00	20.00	18.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	15.00	17.50
Total	94.00	64.00	91.00	85.00	83.50
<i>ESP Associates, Inc.</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	40.00	38.00	20.00	34.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	20.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	20.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	19.50
Total	99.00	90.00	98.00	80.00	91.75
<i>Hydrostructure Utility C&amp;E</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	10.00	16.00	32.00	0.00	14.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	15.00	16.00	15.00	20.00	16.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	17.00	16.00	14.00	10.00	14.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	18.00	20.00	15.00	17.75
Total	60.00	66.00	81.00	45.00	63.00
<i>Seamon Whiteside</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	20.00	16.00	35.00	0.00	17.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	14.00	16.00	15.00	16.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	18.00	16.00	18.00	15.00	16.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	16.00	20.00	15.00	17.25
Total	75.00	62.00	89.00	45.00	67.75
<i>Thomas &amp; Hutton</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	25.00	40.00	38.00	40.00	35.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	18.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	17.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	17.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.25
Total	77.00	88.00	94.00	100.00	89.75
<i>Weston &amp; Sampson</i>					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 5	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	32.00	40.00	39.00	40.00	37.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	14.00	20.00	20.00	18.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
Total	89.00	86.00	99.00	100.00	93.50

RFQ#2020-3282-3306-26  
Evaluator \_\_5\_\_

Criteria	Alliance Consulting Group	Comments	ESP Associates, Inc.	Comments	Hydrostructure s Utility C&E	Comments	Seamon Whiteside	Comments	Thomas & Hutton	Comments	Weston & Sampson	Comments
Teams understanding of the specific requirements of this project (40 Points)	30.00	Specific requirements and understanding fairley basic and generic.	20.00	Did not go into any specific details of the modeling of the gravity system or the pupmp station. They had informtion about the water system which is not part of this project.	0.00	Team did not mention this particular project nor any of the background informtion of this project. They do not give any specific details of what the project consists of.	0.00	Team did not mention this particular project nor any of the background informtion of this project. They do not give any specific details of what the project consists of.	40.00	Great specifics on how the project will be built from start to finish and having workshops through out the design process.	40.00	Great specifics on how the project will be built from start to finish.
Experience, qualifications, and technical competence of the staff proposed for the type of work required (20 Points)	20.00		20.00		20.00		15.00		20.00		20.00	
Past performance of the firm/team on similar type projects (20 Points)	20.00		20.00		10.00	DCWS has ahd some difficulties workig with G Robert George's firm in the past. This firm had to be removed from an ongoing task order and the task order was given to a new firm.	15.00		20.00		20.00	
Availability of proposed staff and ability to be responsive to SCDHEC requirements (20 Points)	15.00		20.00	Gave a good chart of their staffs availability.	15.00		15.00		20.00		20.00	
Total	85.00		80.00		45.00		45.00		100.00		100.00	

RFP#2020-3282-3306-26  
Engineering Services for Poplar Grove Pump Station  
INITIAL Evaluation Tabulation  
**EXCLUDING #5**

#1 Score					
Alliance Consulting Group					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	38.00	16.00	34.00	20.00	27.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	18.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	18.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	19.00	18.00	18.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
Total	94.00	64.00	91.00	78.00	81.75
ESP Associates, Inc.					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	40.00	40.00	38.00	38.00	39.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	20.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	20.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	19.50
Total	99.00	90.00	98.00	98.00	96.25
Hydrostructure Utility C&E					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	10.00	16.00	32.00	20.00	19.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	15.00	16.00	15.00	20.00	16.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	17.00	16.00	14.00	17.00	16.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	18.00	20.00	20.00	19.00
Total	60.00	66.00	81.00	77.00	71.00
Seamon Whiteside					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	20.00	16.00	35.00	20.00	22.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	14.00	16.00	20.00	17.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	18.00	16.00	18.00	18.00	17.50
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	18.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.50
Total	75.00	62.00	89.00	78.00	76.00
Thomas & Hutton					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	25.00	40.00	38.00	25.00	32.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	18.00	20.00	18.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	16.00	16.00	18.00	17.00	16.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	17.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.25
Total	77.00	88.00	94.00	82.00	85.25
Weston & Sampson					
Criteria	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Overall Score
40 POINTS MAXIMUM - Team's Understanding of Project	32.00	40.00	39.00	37.00	37.00
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Experience, Qualifications, and Technical Competence of the Staff Proposed for the Type of Work Required	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Past Performance of the Team/Firm on Similar Types of Projects	19.00	14.00	20.00	20.00	18.25
20 POINTS MAXIMUM - Availability of Proposed Staff and Ability to be Responsive to SCDHEC Requirements	19.00	16.00	20.00	20.00	18.75
Total	89.00	86.00	99.00	97.00	92.75